

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, wherein the video information distribution device comprises a schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data which specifies an order and duration of displaying the dynamic image video information and the processed digital static image video information.

The Examiner alleges that *Oki* and *Bishop* disclose every feature recited in claim 1 except for the above-noted limitation. *DeMoney* is applied in an effort to remedy this deficiency.

*DeMoney* discloses a video synchronization system in which a plurality of movies are stored in a disk array subsystem. A playlist is used to designate at time at which each movie is to be played. A synchronization unit 32 is used to ensure that the specified duration of the movie maintains synchronization with the real-time schedule of the playlist.

While *DeMoney* discloses a display schedule for displaying dynamic image video information (i.e., movies), there is no teaching or suggestion for the playlist designating a time for displaying digital static image video information, as is recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants' claimed schedule management section generates an image control signal that not only specifies an order and duration of displaying the dynamic image video information and the processed digital static image video information, but also instructs the video information receiving and display device restores in advance a state before processing of processed digital static image video information of a next static image to be displayed (see claim 1). Because *DeMoney* only discloses the use of a schedule for playing movies, Applicants submit that this reference does

not and cannot disclose or suggest the generation of an image control signal for displaying the processed digital static image video information, as recited in the claims.

In summary, *Oki*, *Bishop*, and *DeMoney* when applied individually or collectively fail to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination of features recited in independent claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 1 on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oki* in view of *Bishop*, further in view of *DeMoney*, and further in view of *Potrebic et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,824); and in numbered paragraph 2 on page 9 of the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected for allegedly unpatentability over *Oki et al* in view of *Bishop*, further in view of *DeMoney* and further in view of *Duso et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,750). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of these claims variously depends from independent claim 1. By virtue of the respective dependencies, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Moreover, secondary references *Potrebic* and *Duso* do not disclose any features that one of ordinary skill would reasonably believe resolves the aforementioned deficiencies of *Oki*, *Bishop*, and *DeMoney* with respect to independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed appropriate.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 and 8-11 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any issues adverse to allowance remain, the PTO is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 8, 2011

By: /Shawn B. Cage/  
Shawn B. Cage  
Registration No. 51522

**Customer No. 21839**  
703 836 6620